

RCE Response
U.S.S.N. 10/088,614
Page No. 5 of 7

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gott GB 2,041 in view of Garick, U.S. Patent No. 3,758,329, and further in view of Shambelan, U.S. Patent No. 3,531,363. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

By the new citation of the Shambelan patent, the Examiner again admits that the combined teachings of Gott and Garick do not make obvious the presently claimed invention.

However, the citation of Shambelan does not cure this defect. Shambelan discloses only nonwoven fabrics made by adhesively bonding warp-direction yarns to weft-direction yarns (i.e., warp-direction yarns turned 90°). See column 3, lines 1-5 of Shambelan.

In fact, Shambelan teaches several ways to bond the crossed-yarns – but no way to bond substantially parallel yarns. See, Col. 2, line 57 to Col. 3, line 30, which teaches these three ways to bond the crossed-yarns:

- (1) The yarns are “self-bonding” by use of a hot embossing plate; or
- (2) The yarns are bonded by adhesive applied by a “print bond” technique, with adhesive applied only where the yarn strands intersect; or
- (3) The yarns are joined “binderlessly” by forced entanglement of bulky, texturized free-ends through use of “fine columnar streams of a liquid.

Clearly, nothing in Shambelan is useful for teaching the present invention – either alone or when considered in combination with the teachings of Gott and Garick. Clearly

RCE Response
U.S.S.N. 10/088,614
Page No. 6 of 7

the proposed combination of these three references does not disclose the presently claimed invention, which defines a non-woven fabric as follows:

- (1) non-woven fabric which consists essentially of substantially parallel warp-direction yarns,
- (2) supported and bonded on only one side by an adhesive coating, and
- (3) said adhesive coating being non-continuous.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this RCE filing is clearly in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued.

However, should the Examiner disagree, rather than issuing a First Action Final Rejection herein, Applicant respectfully requests an Interview with the Examiner, as detailed below.

INTERVIEW REQUEST

Attached is Form PTOL-413A – “Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form.” As stated therein, Applicant, through the undersigned, respectfully requests a telephonic interview with Examiner Cole to be held on May 13, 2005 at 2:00 p.m. to discuss the prior art cited in the Final Rejection, and the arguments submitted herein regarding the same. The undersigned will telephone the Examiner at the stated time.